



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/051,012	01/22/2002	Ariel Peled	02/23252	7791
7590 Martin D. Moynihan PRTSI, Inc. P. O. Box 16446 Arlington, VA 22215	06/28/2007		EXAMINER REVAK, CHRISTOPHER A	
			ART UNIT 2131	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/28/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/051,012	PELED ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Christopher A. Revak	2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### **Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 April 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### **Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 1-3, 6, 11, 15, 17, 21, 22, 35, 36, 59, 71, 74, 80, 180 and 181 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### **Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 22 January 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### **Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### **Attachment(s)**

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims pending in the application are 1-3,6,11,15,17,21,22,35,36,59,71,74,80,108,117,120,124,125,152,157,166,174,180 and 181.

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims rejected are 108,117,120,124,125,152,157,166, and 174.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3,6,11,15,17,21,22,35,36,59,71, 74,80,180, and 181 have been fully considered and are persuasive.
2. Applicant's arguments filed have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. As per claims 108,117,120,124,125,152,157,166, and 174, it is argued by the applicant that neither teachings of Wang or Flavin et al disclose of " al wherein said trusted environment comprising a watchdog component and at least one digital content handling component for producing said version from said digital content, wherein said watchdog component is capable of monitoring at least one of said digital content handling components". The examiner disagrees with the applicant's assertion, the teachings of Flavin et al disclose al of a watchdog component and at least one digital content handling component for producing said version from said digital content, wherein said watchdog component is capable of monitoring at least one of said digital content handling components, see column 4, lines 16-30. The watchdog component of Flavin is dedicated towards the monitoring of the digital content.
3. The examiner notes that on page 7 of the remarks filed April 2, 2007, claims 62,109, and 116 are currently pending. These claims have been cancelled in the amendment filed on April 2, 2007.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 108,117,120,124,125,152,157,166, and 174 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang, U.S. Patent 6,885,748 in view of Flavin et al, U.S. Patent 6,219,788.

As per claim 108, it is disclosed by Wang of a method for secure distribution of digital content comprising the steps of transferring said digital content to an untrusted environment; using a trusted environment within said untrusted environment, said trusted environment being operable to produce a version of said digital content and further being comprised of mechanisms to restrict tampering thereof, wherein said version is rendered for a display (Col. 11, lines 15-29 and Col. 12, lines 16-27). It is not disclosed by Wang et al wherein said trusted environment comprising a watchdog component and at least one digital content handling component for producing said version from said digital content, wherein said watchdog component is capable of monitoring at least one of said digital content handling components. The teachings of Flavin et al disclose wherein said trusted environment comprising a watchdog component and at least one digital content handling component for producing said version from said digital content, wherein said watchdog component is capable of monitoring at least one of said digital content handling components (Col. 2, lines 38-64).

and Col. 4, lines 16-30). Wang and Flavin are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting distributed content. It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to include the watchdog of Flavin in the system of Wang in order to monitor the trustworthiness of the distributor or user of the author's content and prevent unauthorized use (Col. 2, lines 38-64).

As per claim 117, Wang and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 108. Flavin further teaches said monitoring comprises of authentication (Col. 4 lines 32-43 and Col. 3 lines 59-65). Wang and Flavin are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting distributed content. It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to include the watchdog of Flavin in the system of Wang in order to monitor the trustworthiness of the distributor or user of the author's content and prevent unauthorized use (Col. 2, lines 38-64).

As per claim 120, Wang and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 117. Flavin further teaches said authentication comprises authentication of the code of the component (See Col. 5 lines 25-28). Wang and Flavin are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting distributed content. It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to include the watchdog of Flavin in the system of Wang in order to monitor the trustworthiness of the distributor or user of the author's content and prevent unauthorized use (See Col. 2, lines 38-64).

As per claim 124, Wang and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 108. Flavin further teaches said monitoring comprises monitoring of the operation of said components (Abstract and Col. 3 lines 36-41). Wang and Flavin are analogous art

because they are both directed to methods for protecting distributed content. It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to include the watchdog of Flavin in the system of Wang in order to monitor the trustworthiness of the distributor or user of the author's content and prevent unauthorized use (See Col. 2, lines 38-64).

As per claim 125, Wang and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 124. Flavin further teaches said monitoring of the operation of said components comprise monitoring of used interfaces (Col. 5 lines 28-33). Wang and Flavin are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting distributed content. It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to include the watchdog of Flavin in the system of Wang in order to monitor the trustworthiness of the distributor or user of the author's content and prevent unauthorized use (Col. 2, lines 38-64).

As per claim 152, Wang is applied as stated in the rejection of claim 108. Wang fails to teach a watchdog component. Flavin is directed towards a method for trusted electronic content distribution which teaches at least one of said components comprise a plurality of interfaces and functionality to monitor at least one of said interfaces (Col. 5 lines 28-33 and Col. 4, lines 16-30). Wang and Flavin are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting distributed content. It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to include the watchdog of Flavin in the system of Wang in order to monitor the trustworthiness of the distributor or user of the author's content and prevent unauthorized use (Col. 2, lines 38-64).

As per claim 157, Wang and Flavin are applied as stated in the rejection of claim 152. Flavin further teaches functionality to monitor at least one of said interfaces used

by the underlying system (Col. 5 lines 28-33 and Col. 4, lines 16-30). Wang and Flavin are analogous art because they are both directed to methods for protecting distributed content. It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to include the watchdog of Flavin in the system of Wang in order to monitor the trustworthiness of the distributor or user of the author's content and prevent unauthorized use (Col. 2, lines 38-64).

As per claim 166, it is taught by Wang wherein said trusted environment comprises a mechanism to restrict copying of at least one of the outputs said trusted environment generates (Col. 15, lines 19-39).

As per claim 174, it is disclosed by Wang wherein said mechanism to restrict copying is comprised of altering the output in order to change a quality of the copy which is produced by said copying (Col. 18, lines 5-30). Examiner asserts that if the user attempts to copy a document and they do not have the right to do so, the document would remain encrypted and would not be viewable.

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

6. Claims 1-3,6,11,15,17,21,22,35,36,59,71, 74,80,180, and 181 are allowed.
7. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: It was not found to be taught in the prior art of gathering information about the digital content's intended recipient environment, producing a trustworthiness credential about the intended recipient environment based on the information, selecting protective measures for distribution of the digital content in accordance with the trustworthiness credential, constructing a trusted environment in the untrusted environment, transferring

digital content to the trusted environment such that it is transmitted via a different path and combining input sources within the trusted environment in order to reproduce the digital content.

***Conclusion***

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher A. Revak whose telephone number is 571-272-3794. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 6:30am-3:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

CR  
JUL 23, 2007

CHRISTOPHER REVAK  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

